

# Exhibit 3

October 11, 2017

**Via E-mail**

Charles H. Sanders, Esq.  
Anant K. Saraswat, Esq.  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
John Hancock Tower, 27th Floor  
200 Clarendon Street  
Boston, MA 02116

Daniel M. Radke, Esq.  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111-6538

Lawrence J. Gotts, Esq.  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, N.W. Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304

*Re: Nitride Semiconductors Co., Ltd. v. Digi-Key Corp.*, D. Minn. No. 0:17-cv-04359

Counsel:

We represent Defendant Digi-Key Corp. ("Digi-Key") in the above captioned matter filed September 22, 2017 in the District of Minnesota. In its Complaint against Digi-Key, plaintiff Nitride Semiconductors Co., Ltd. ("Nitride") accuses Digi-Key of infringing U.S. Patent No. 6,861,270 ("270 patent") based on the alleged use, offer for sale, and/or sale of RayVio Corp.'s ("RayVio") UV LEDs. Indeed, the only accused products identified in Nitride's Complaint are manufactured by RayVio. As you are aware, Nitride has already brought suit against RayVio in the Northern District of California for its alleged infringement of the '270 patent for the same accused products, including Part No. RVXP4-280-SM-076232 ("XP4-280-SM-076232"). Specifically, XP4-280-SM-076232 is identified in both Nitride's Complaint against Digi-Key and Nitride's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions served September 8, 2017 in its matter against RayVio pending in the Northern District of California.

Given RayVio is the manufacturer of the accused products in the matter against Digi-Key, and Digi-Key is its distributor of the accused products, Nitride's claims against Digi-Key are peripheral to and duplicative of its claims against RayVio. Indeed, as a distributor, Digi-Key has no part in the manufacture, research, development, or engineering of the accused products. Moreover, adjudication of the claims against RayVio in the Northern District of California will necessarily dispose of any claims against Digi-Key. Indeed, if RayVio is found not to infringe the '270 patent or if the '270 patent is found invalid, there would be no need to proceed against Digi-Key in the District of Minnesota. And, if a judgment is obtained against RayVio, and RayVio recovers on that judgment, Nitride may not also collect against Digi-Key.

Accordingly, to preserve judicial economy, Digi-Key requests that Nitride consent to stay the action against Digi-Key pending the outcome of the proceeding against RayVio in the Northern District of California. Indeed, each of the factors that courts consider in connection with a stay of the case weigh heavily in favor of staying the matter against Digi-Key. Please let us know by Monday, October 9, 2017 whether Nitride will not oppose Digi-Key's motion to stay the above-captioned matter, or let us know when

you are available this or next week to meet and confer to discuss Digi-Key's motion to stay.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Robert Kramer*

Robert F. Kramer